



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/871,457	05/31/2001	John Merrells	13220.014001;P5849	9817

7590 04/27/2005  
JONATHAN P. OSHA  
ROSENTHAL & OSHA L.L.P.  
1221 MC KINNEY AVENUE  
SUITE 2800  
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER

ISMAL, SHAWKI SAIF

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/871,457

Applicant(s)

MERRELLS ET AL.

Examiner

Shawki S. Ismail

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                        |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                       | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

### **RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT**

1. Claims 1-22 remain for further examination. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-22 filed on December 2, 2004 have been fully considered.

### **The old rejection maintained**

2. The rejection is respectfully maintained as set forth in the last Office Action mailed on September 3, 2004. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and; therefore, the old rejection is maintained.

### **Drawings**

3. The drawings filed on May 31, 2001 have been accepted.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant-admitted prior art, hereinafter "**AAPA**" and in view of U.S. Patent No. **6,547,829** issued to **Meyerzon et al.**, (Meyerzon),

6. As to claim 1, 8, 15, 18, 21, and 22, AAPA teaches a method of addressing and generating an entry into a directory server (Figure 2, Directory server 80, an iPlanet LDAP-based directory server; see also page 3 paragraph [0011]; and further teaches creating an encoded address into a distinguished name for the entry (pages 6-7 paragraph [0021], a distinguished name is a unique unambiguous name of an entry in LDAP); and specifying the entry for a plurality of operations (pages 6-7 paragraph [0021]).

AAPA, however, does not explicitly teach generating a Unique Identifier (UniqueID). This element has been taught in the Applicant's disclosure in Figure 10, step 112 and pages 12-13 paragraph [0053]. A "system time" has been utilized to generate the unique identifier.

In an analogous system Meyerzon, teaches a method for detecting duplicate documents in Web Crawl by using content identifier (CID). The CID (equivalent to the SID described by U.S. Patent No. 5,813,008, which is incorporated in the Meyerzon patent) includes a globally unique identifier (GUID) that uniquely identifies the server that is creating the CID. The system time is included as one of four subparts in the GUID. (Figure 3, col. 2-3, line 53 – col. 3 line 21, col. 10, lines 1-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of (AAPA) and Meyerzon, and

incorporate the Unique Identifier (UniqueID) for the entries in the directory server to keep track of entries entering the directory. Meyerzon would help the system avoid conflicting updates of its entries in a directory by assigning each entry a Unique Id which would unambiguously refer to an entry in a distributed or replicated environment. This will help reduce unnecessarily entering and processing such duplicates (col.2, lines 30-44).

7. As to claim 2, 9, 16, and 19, Meyerzon teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the unique identifier comprises a multi-bit number having a first octet set to an identifier type and a plurality of remaining bits set to an identifier (Figure 3 see also col.10, lines 1-23, the GUID contains 16 bytes which includes four sub-parts: system time, version number, clock sequence, and a network address.)

8. As to claim 3, 10, 17, and 20, Meyerzon teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the unique identifier comprises a multi-bit number having a first octet set to zero and a plurality of remaining octets set to an identifier generated in accordance with a unique identifier specification (Figure 3 see also col.10, lines 1-23, the GUID contains 16 bytes which includes four sub-parts: system time, version number, clock sequence, and a network address.)

9. Claims 4-7, and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. **6,547,829** issued to **Meyerzon et al.**, (Meyerzon), and in view of U.S. Patent No. **5,117,351** issued to **Miller**.

10. As to claim 4-7, and 11-14, Meyerzon teaches the method of claim 1, wherein generating the unique identifier is time-based. In order to generate a Unique ID one

Art Unit: 2155

would have to incorporate a generation algorithm. Meyerzon however, does not explicitly teach the unique ID generation algorithm used to generate the Unique ID.

Miller an analogous system, teaches Unique labeling of objects within a system using a Unique ID. The Unique ID may be generated by a number of algorithms random or sequential or name (col.2, lines 27-68)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Meyerzon and Miller to incorporate a single-threaded, multi-threaded, random-based, or name-based algorithm to generate the Unique ID because anyone of these methods would be sufficient to generate a Unique ID.

### **Response to Arguments**

11. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-22 filed on December 2, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

12. In the remarks, the applicants argue in substance that:

(A) Argument: applicant argue that AAPA does not teach generating a Unique Identifier (UniqueID) for the entry (applicants' remarks, Page 3, paragraphs 1 and 2).

Response: On page 3, paragraphs 1 and 2, applicant asserts that AAPA does not teach generating a UniqueID for the entry. Applicant has mischaracterized the rejection. The rejection is based on two references. AAPA does not teach "UniqueID". Examiner indicated that one Page 2 of the Office Action sent on September 3, 2004. Examiner included Meyerzon to show the "UniqueID". In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by

Art Unit: 2155

attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

### **Contact Information**


14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawki S Ismail whose telephone number is 571-272-3985. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2155

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shawki Ismail  
Patent Examiner  
April 22, 2005



HOSAIN ALAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER